

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Samuel Jefferson

Plaintiff,

v.

Corizon Healthcare Providers; et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 3:12-cv-0988

Judge Sharp

Magistrate Judge Bryant

ORDER :

The motion for leave  
to amend (Docket Entry No.  
137) has been denied  
(Docket Entry No. 167).

Therefore, this motion  
is denied as  
moot.

John Bryant,  
USAJ

**DEFENDANT ELI LILLY AND COMPANY'S MOTION TO STRIKE "PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND AS A MATTER OF COURSE WITH RELATION  
BACK OF AMENDMENT DOCTRINE, IN SUPPORT THERE OF"**

Defendant Eli Lilly and Company ("Lilly") requests an order striking Plaintiff's submission entitled "PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND AS A MATTER OF COURSE WITH RELATION BACK OF AMENDMENT DOCTRINE, IN SUPPORT THERE OF" [Docket No. 137] (the "Motion") on the grounds that it is unintelligible, nonsensical and not recognized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Notwithstanding a litigant's *pro se* status, a motion to strike should be granted where it is impossible to understand the submission in question. *See, e.g., Mann v. Swiggett*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 163347, \*3-4 (E.D.N.C. Oct. 9, 2012) (noting that the district judge had granted a motion to strike because the *pro se* litigant had "continued to clutter the docket with nonsensical filings and continued to disregard this court's orders, the local rules, and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure"); *Lincoln Diagnostics, Inc. v. Panatrex, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41649, \*53 (C.D. Ill. May 29, 2008) (granting a party's motion to strike where the pleading was "essentially 'unintelligible'").